



SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF
CALIFORNIA, by and through the
CALIFORNIA CORPORATIONS
COMMISSIONER,

Plaintiff,

vs.

SMARTWEAR TECHNOLOGIES, a San
Diego County fictitious business name;
SMARTWEAR TECHNOLOGIES, INC., a
Delaware corporation;
NORMAN FRANK REED, an individual;
ROBERT REED, an individual;
SEAN BORZAGE BOYD, an individual; and
Does 1 through 10, inclusive,

Defendants,

And

GLOBAL GENERAL TECHNOLOGIES,
INC., a Nevada corporation; and
LEXIT TECHNOLOGY, INC., a Colorado
corporation,

Relief Defendants.

Case No.: 37-2008-00091291-CU-MC-CTL

[PROPOSED] ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE
RE: PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

Judge: Hon. Judith F. Hayes
Dept: D-68

Ex Parte Hearing Date: November 18, 2008
Ex Parte Hearing Time: 8:45 a.m.
Hearing Date: January 9, 2009
Hearing Time: 10:30 a.m.
Date Action Filed: September 9, 2008

///

TO ALL DEFENDANTS AND THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD:

The Ex Parte Application for an Order to Show Cause Re: Preliminary Injunction came on regularly at the above date and time and in the Department indicated. Plaintiff, the People of the State of California by and through the California Corporations Commissioner (“Commissioner”), was represented by Corporations Counsel Alex Calero.

After consideration of Plaintiff’s Ex Parte Application, First Amended Complaint, Memorandum of Points and Authorities and Declarations filed in support thereof and other oral and documentary evidence, the Court finds that the People have demonstrated a likelihood of prevailing on the merits of the action and the absence of any substantive opposition or defense to the request for injunctive relief, and FOR GOOD CAUSE APPEARING,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

An Order to Show Cause hearing shall be held on January 9, 2009, at 10:30 a.m., in Department 68 of this Court, at which time Norman Frank Reed, Robert Reed, Sean Borzage Boyd, SmartWear Technologies, a San Diego County fictitious business name, SmartWear Technologies, Inc., a Delaware corporation (collectively “DEFENDANTS”), and Global Technologies, Inc., a Nevada corporation, and Lexit Technology, Inc., a Colorado corporation (collectively “RELIEF DEFENDANTS”) shall show why a preliminary injunction should not be granted, enjoining:

1. DEFENDANTS, their agents, employees, attorneys in fact, and all other persons acting in concert or participating with them, from directly or indirectly:

a. Violating California Corporations Code section 25110 by offering to sell, selling, arranging for the sale of, issuing, engaging in the business of selling, or negotiating for the sale of any security of any kind unless such security or transaction is qualified;

b. Violating California Corporations Code section 25401 by offering to sell or selling any security of any kind by means of any written or oral communication which includes any untrue statement of material fact or omits to state any material fact necessary in order to make the statements made, in the light of the circumstances under which they are made, not misleading;

2. DEFENDANTS and RELIEF DEFENDANTS, their agents, employees, attorneys in fact, and all other persons acting in concert or participating with them, from directly or indirectly:

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED THAT:

The following briefing schedule shall apply: If DEFENDANTS and RELIEF DEFENDANTS choose to submit written statements or objections to the issuance of a preliminary injunction, papers must be filed with the Court no later than _____, by _____ a.m./p.m., and served by overnight mail on Plaintiff. If Plaintiff chooses to file a reply, papers must be filed no later than _____, by _____ a.m./p.m., and served by overnight mail on the DEFENDANTS and RELIEF DEFENDANTS.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 18, 2008
San Diego, California

JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT